

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-20 are pending. Claims 10 and 14 are currently canceled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

37 CFR 1.83(a) Objection

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Applicant submits that the current drawings are in compliance with this provision because they show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The “set of interchangeable horns” is shown, for example, at Figure 6, element 173. The detailed description of Figure 6 states that air emerges from the body of the spray gun from “the apertures 175 in the horns 173” (Applicant’s PCT Specification at page 14, lines 11-13). Thus, the objection to the drawings has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

§ 112 Rejections

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement because the specification fails to disclose how to adjust the inward air streams for controlling the spray characteristics. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reason.

Adjustment of the inward air stream is made by attaching the horns and horn members to the spray gun body as shown, for example, at Figure 6, elements 160, 161, and 173. The physical characteristics of the particular horns and horn members attached to the spray gun body change the liquid spray pattern via the inward air streams emerging from the horn apertures (see, e.g., Applicant’s PCT Specification at page 5, lines 16-21). In the detailed description of Figure 6, the specification states that the “horns 173 may be detachably secured to the front end of the spray head body 158 by any suitable means. For example, the members 160,161 may clip on the spray head body 158. In this way, the spray head 150 can be adapted according to the desired atomization parameters or spray pattern of the paint to be sprayed by selecting and fitting the appropriate pair of members 160,161 to vary the size and/or position of the horns 173 to control the flow and/or direction of the air emerging from the horns for mixing with the paint/air streams

emerging from the nozzle 153” (Applicant’s PCT Specification at page 14, line 31 to page 15, line 6).

In view of the above, it is submitted that claim 19 meets the requirements of 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, and is in condition for allowance.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 17-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mattson. The Applicant avers that the current claim amendments overcome this rejection. Independent claims 1, 15, and 20 have been amended to include “wherein the liquid reservoir is disposable and can be discarded after use.” The Mattson reference, in contrast, does not disclose the use of a disposable liquid reservoir. Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 17-19 are patentable due to their ultimate dependency on one of the independent claims, as well as on their own merits. Thus, the rejection of claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, and 17-20 as being anticipated by Mattson has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattson in view of McRitchie.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a liquid spray apparatus comprising a spray gun, including, among other things, a disposable liquid reservoir. Mattson does not teach or suggest a disposable reservoir, and in fact, makes no mention of a fluid reservoir. McRitchie likewise does not contain a teaching or suggestion of a disposable liquid reservoir. Claims 2 and 8 each add additional features to claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable for the reasons given above. Thus, claims 2 and 8 are likewise patentable.

Claims 3-5, 9-11, and 16 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattson in view of Holt. Claims 3-5, 9-11, and 16 each add additional features to Claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable for the reasons given above. Thus, claims 3-5, 9-11, and 16 are likewise patentable.

In summary, the rejection of claims 2-5, 8-11, and 16 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattson in view of McRitchie and Holt has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Examination and reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

August 1, 2008

Date

By: /Pamela L. Stewart/

Pamela L. Stewart, Reg. No.: 45,707

Telephone No.: 651-733-2059

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833